**From:** POULSEN Mike
**To:** Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
**Cc:** PETERSON Jenn L; Dana Davoli/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
**Subject:** RE: Fw: Round 3 Detection Limits - Fish Tissue
**Date:** 04/23/2009 03:40 PM

---

That is definitely one of the issues. Jennifer has seen some good relationships between sediment data and tissue data on scales smaller than the LWG is looking at. You won't necessarily find that site-wide (particularly if there are detection limit issues), partly because we have different mixes of congeners in different areas of the site. Jennifer may have some other concerns, too.

- Mike

-----Original Message-----
From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 23, 2009 3:29 PM
To: Davoli.Dana@epamail.epa.gov
Cc: PETERSON Jenn L; POULSEN Mike
Subject: Re: Fw: Round 3 Detection Limits - Fish Tissue

OK - now I get it. The issue is that the PRG for 126 may not be good due to the prevalence of non-detects in the tissue data set used for the development of the PRG through the FWM or application of BSAFs. Correct?

Eric

Dana Davoli/R10/USEPA/US — 04/23/2009 02:59 PM

To: poulsen.mike@deq.state.or.us, Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
cc: PETERSON Jenn L <PETERSON.Jenn@deq.state.or.us>
Subject: Fw: Round 3 Detection Limits - Fish Tissue

I think the issue is with the biota, not sediment. I have to go for a treatment now, so we can talk more tomorrow or Monday.
----- Forwarded by Dana Davoli/R10/USEPA/US on 04/23/2009 02:58 PM -----

"PETERSON Jenn L" <PETERSON.Jenn@deq.state.or.us> — 10/02/2008 02:41 PM

To: "ANDERSON Jim M" <ANDERSON.Jim@deq.state.or.us>, Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
cc: Dana Davoli/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: Round 3 Detection Limits - Fish Tissue

I won't be at the TCT next week, but I wanted to make sure an issue is discussed regarding the Round 3 biota tissue. The PCB congener detection limits are very high, and the fish tissue was not analyzed for Aroclors. How are we going to use this data moving forward (e.g. food web model, etc., TEQ calculations, etc.)? Is there a change to re-analyze the tissue?

I am attaching a spreadsheet showing the detection limits for PCB 126 for smallmouth bass as an example.

-Jennifer

[attachment "PCB126_ND Conc.xls" deleted by Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US]

----- Forwarded by Dana Davoli/R10/USEPA/US on 04/23/2009 02:59 PM -----

"POULSEN Mike"

<POULSEN.Mike@deq.state.or.us>

04/23/2009 02:45 PM

To: Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
cc: Dana Davoli/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: RE: PCB 126

Eric -

Let's wait until Monday so I can match this up with Jennifer's plots. I'm not thinking very clearly at the moment.

- Mike

-----Original Message-----
From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 23, 2009 1:17 PM
To: POULSEN Mike; Davoli.Dana@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: PCB 126

Attached is a screenshot from QM of the PCB 126 concentrations relative to the two PRGs we are mapping - 0.042 ug/kg and 0.0064 ug/kg. I really do not see the issue with detection limits. Cans someone clarify this for me?

Thanks, Eric

(See attached file: PCB126HHPRG.bmp)